

## **REMARKS**

By this Amendment, claims 7, 11, 17, 22 and 25 have been amended, and new claims 28-32 have been added. Thus, claims 7-11 and 17-32 are now pending.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and allow the subject application in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 7 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wetters et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,336,473). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended herein, independent claim 7 recites an electric motor comprising, among other things, a fan having a plurality of blades and a baffle including an annular section having a curved surface extending axially above at least a portion of the fan, wherein *the blades of the fan have a shape corresponding to the curved surface of the annular section of the baffle*. (Emphasis added). Support for this amendment can be found, among other places, in Figs. 2 and 2A and paragraphs 0029 and 0034 of the subject application.

In contrast, Wetters merely discloses an annular baffle 71. However, this baffle 71 does not include a curved surface extending axially above at least a portion of the fan 63. Further, the blades of the fan 63 are not shaped to correspond to a curved surface of the baffle 71. Instead, Wetters' fan blades appear to employ straight edges only. See Fig. 1 of Wetters. Accordingly, Wetters fails to anticipate amended claim 7 and claim 21 which depends therefrom.

Claims 7-9, 17-19 and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wanner (DE 2910845). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Similar to claim 7, independent claim 25 has been amended to recite fan blades having a shape corresponding to the curved portion of a baffle positioned axially above a portion of a fan.

Similar to Wetters, Wanner lacks any teaching or suggestion of this recited subject matter. As shown in Figs. 2 and 4 of Wanner, the baffle 24 clearly does not include a curved surface extending axially above a portion of the fan, with fan blades having a shape corresponding to such a curved surface. Instead, Wanner's fan blades appear to employ straight edges only. See, e.g., Fig. 2 of Wanner. Accordingly, Wanner fails to anticipate independent claims 7 and 25, and claims 8, 9 17-19 and 21-27 which depend therefrom.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wanner (DE 2910845). However, claim 10 is allowable over Wanner for at least the same reasons as independent claim 7, discussed above, from which claim 10 depends.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's favorable indication that claims 11 and 20 recite allowable subject matter. In response, claim 11 has been amended into independent form. Claim 20 depends (indirectly) from independent claim 7 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 7, discussed above.

### **NEW CLAIMS 28-32**

By this Amendment, new claims 28-32 have been added. New claims 28-30 depend from independent claim 7. Support for these claims can be found, among other places, in Figs. 2 and 2A and paragraphs 0029 and 0033 of the subject application. Claim 31 also depends from claim 7 and is similar to original claim 11.


New claim 32 recites a motor having a ventilation system comprising, among other things, a fan having a plurality of blades and a baffle including an annular section, a central opening and a lip surrounding the central opening. The lip has a curved convex surface. The fan blades have a shape corresponding to the curved convex surface of the lip. Support for new claim 32 can be found, among other places, in Figs. 2 and 2A and paragraph 0029 of the subject application. Because the cited art fails to disclose or suggest this recited subject matter, Application respectfully submits that claim 32 should be allowed as well.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2-21-06

By:   
Michael J. Thomas, Reg. 39,857

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
(314) 726-7500